

## Notes from October 19, 2010 11AM EDT NanoRelease Steering Committee call

On the call: Andy Atkinson; Debbie Kaiser; Lie Chen; Janet Carter; Mike Davis; Darrell Boverhoff; Jo Anne Shatkin; Chuck Geraci; Carolyn Cairns; Michael Hansen; Shaun Clancy

The discussion lasted for approximately 50 minutes.

### 1) Selection of co-chairs

The committee discussed the idea of having co-chairs lead subcommittees that could include additional participants and “in-kind” support beyond the membership of the Steering Committee, and discussed rotating the chairs on a periodic basis over the course of the project to share work. General agreement was expressed on these approaches.

### 2) Discussion of the “expectations” statements that committee members submitted prior to the meeting lead to expression of a number of ideas that received general agreement.

- The expectations suggest that the project will be developing both intangible items (like generalized knowledge and trust in decisions) and tangible items like methods and data. It will be important to acknowledge both kinds of outputs, but ensure that the tangible outputs are achieved.
- The opinion was expressed that another “in-actionable documenting of information” would be a waste of our time. For example, if the project finds that for a given material there are not adequate methods for detection in a matrix or for nanomaterials as released, then the project should follow through and identify the barriers to detection and go the next step of trying to develop methods to detect.
- We need to build on existing efforts, such as the EPA comprehensive exposure assessment case studies, and the OECD Working Party on Manufactured Nanomaterials sponsorship and exposure assessment work.
- Participants were asked whether they were working on methods-development projects and in response the following were identified.
  - i. NIST has projects on assays in rat blood; reference material generation for TiO<sub>2</sub>, carbon nanotubes, and silver; a stability study for silver; research on release of nanoclays on incineration of insulation (with CPSC); and release of nanomaterials from solid matrices due to wear. NIST also is participating in ISO, ASTM, and ANSI activities on nanomaterials.
  - ii. NIOSH has a number of aerosol projects; 4 projects on material characterization and risk assessment in collaboration with European partners under FP7; and noted interest from companies in characterizing release of carbon nanotubes from composite materials along the value chain and life cycle.
  - iii. EPA has a number of projects on developing and improving methods for detection of nanomaterials.
  - iv. There are a number of projects in academic or research organizations that have measurement and life cycle focus. Many are funded at least in part by

government granting agencies and are identified in a recent National Nanotechnology Initiative data call internal to government. Two NSF/EPA centers on environmental safety and health, and efforts by ONAMI and CEINT were noted in particular.

3) Discussion of process and next steps

- It was noted that ILSI RF will make efforts to invite input to the project from stakeholders who are not part of the Steering Committee, for example, through providing information about the project on the ILSI RF web site and inviting comment.
- The committee agreed that an initial step for organizing thought on selection of materials and methods is to select criteria, or at least develop a list of important criteria for the materials and methods that should be chosen for detailed evaluation. The thought is to develop a criteria list and then narrow the material/methods choices. Through discussion of criteria and material choices we will also identify issues that would then be addressed through the workshop. We will see how far we can get through email, but Canady will also seek to set up a second committee call in the next 3 weeks to discuss the criteria and workshop planning. Some of the criteria mentioned in the call were:
  - i. Broadly applicable to consumer exposure
  - ii. Critical features for measurement (e.g., surface coating, charge, etc)
  - iii. Most relevant to materials in commerce
  - iv. Relevant to specific applications of materials
  - v. Consider relative importance of one class of nanomaterials versus another
  - vi. Easy chance of success – don't choose something impossible as the first round

Other criteria were proposed in the statements submitted prior to the meeting.

4) Follow up items for committee members

- Canady will follow up with committee members to get links to or descriptions of the projects mentioned that are relevant to our decisions, so that we can add them to the database being developed for projects with data, or to which we could link our efforts.
- Canady will develop an initial list of decision criteria for materials and methods, and ask for additions through email.
- Canady will initiate a second call of the group.